

REMARKS

Claims 1 through 12 remain pending in the present application. Claims 1 through 3 have been amended. Basis for the amendments can be found throughout the specification, drawings and claims as originally filed.

The undersigned attorney would like to thank Examiner Watts for the courtesies extended to him during the personal interview on May 18, 2005. At the interview, an agreement was not reached. During the interview, the claim language was discussed.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph

The Examiner has rejected the claims under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, alleging them to be indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention. Applicant has amended the claims in an attempt to overcome the Examiner's rejection. In light of the above amendments, Applicant believes the claims to overcome the Examiner's §112 rejection and respectfully requests withdrawal of the same.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a), or in the alternative 102(b)

The Examiner alleges that Claims 1, 2 and 3 are obvious or anticipated by Wagner, Giacometti et al and Hartman, respectively. The Examiner alleges that these combinations disclose Applicant's invention.

The claims have been amended to further define the support engaging the reciprocating work member to provide a reaction force on the working member along a line of action of the tool. The line of action of the tool is substantially perpendicular to the work piece and the reaction force is substantially parallel to the line of action.

The art relied on by the Examiner fails to disclose or suggest such a feature. All of the references cited by the Examiner illustrate a member for clamping the blade onto the reciprocating member. None of these references illustrate a support member which applies a force onto the working member or blade along the line action of the tool which is substantially perpendicular to the work piece and parallel along the line of action. Further, as was pointed out at the interview, none of these devices include the support and mount positioned outside of the housing. Accordingly, Applicant believes Claims 1, 2 and 3, and their depending claims, to be patentably distinct over the art cited by the Examiner.

In light of the above amendments and remarks, Applicant would submit that all pending claims are in condition for allowance. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to pass the case to issue at his earliest possible convenience. Should the Examiner have any questions regarding the present application, he should not hesitate to contact the undersigned at (248) 641-1600.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: June 3, 2005

By: 

W. R. Duke Taylor
Reg. No. 31,306

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.
P.O. Box 828
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303
(248) 641-1600

WRDT/jp